

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/561,161	12/16/2005	Eva-Lotte Lindstedt-Alstermark	056291-5220 2022		
9629 MORGAN LE	9629 7590 06/20/2007 MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP			EXAMINER	
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW			PARSA, JAFAR F		
WASHINGTON, DC 20004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1621		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/20/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/561,161	LINDSTEDT-ALSTERMARK ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Jafar Parsa	1621
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA assions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. \$ 133)
Status			
2a)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 De This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Dispositi	on of Claims		
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) <u>6-8</u> is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or		
Applicati	on Papers		•
10)[The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment	(c)	•	
1) Notice 2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 12/16/2005.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	ite

Application/Control Number: 10/561,161

Art Unit: 1621

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alstermark et al (WO 03/051826 A1) in view of Rossen et al (5,663,341) or Alstermark et al alone.

Applicants claimed invention is directed to a process for the preparation of substantially racemic 2-{[2-(4-hydroxyphenyl)ethyl]thio}-3-[4-(2-{4-[(methylsulfonyl)oxy]phenox- y}ethyl)phenyl]-propanoic acid which comprises reacting 2-{[2-(4-hydroxyphenyl)ethyl]thio}-3-[4-(2-{4-[(methylsulfonyl)oxy]phenox-y}ethyl)phenyl]propanoic acid enriched in one enantiomer with a base in an inert solvent.

Alstermark discloses a racemic mixture of the instant claimed compound.

Alstermark is silent with respect to the conversion of the specified enantiomer to a racemic mixture. The conversion of an enantimeric compound to a racemic mixture is well known in the art. For instance, Rossen teaches an enantimeric of a compound dissolved in a solvent (THF) in the presence of a strong base (potassium tert-butoxide) and heated for 3 hours to obtain a racemic mixture.

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to prepare a racemic mixture by dissolving the enantiomeric of that compound in a solvent in the presence of a strong base to obtain a racemic mixture, which can be used as an intermediate for preparing other chemical compounds as suggested by Rossen et al.

An additional racemization step in an otherwise known process is not a patentable modification. <u>Brenner v. Ladd</u>, 147 U.S.P.Q. 87, 90 (D.C. 1965).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-8 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jafar Parsa whose telephone number is (571)272-0643. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m.-4:30 p.m. (M-F).

Application/Control Number: 10/561,161

Art Unit: 1621

Page 4

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jafar Parsa

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1621

JP

June 9, 2007

J. PARSA

PRIMARY EXAMINER